

**BALTIMORE CITY DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING
URBAN DESIGN AND ARCHITECTURE REVIEW PANEL
MEETING MINUTES**

Date: May 22, 2014

Meeting No.: 185

Project: Johns Hopkins South of Orleans PUD
Skip Viragh Outpatient Building (SVOB)

Phase: Revised Master Plan/Cont.Schematic

Location: Northeast corner at intersection of Fayette Street and Broadway

PRESENTATION:

1. Anthony Cataldo from the City of Baltimore Office of Planning introduced the project and the project team. The project had two work sessions with the development team and planning staff, the most recent on May 22, 2014 in the morning. The team presenting to the panel was introduced - Michael Iati, AIA, Director of Architecture and Planning for the Johns Hopkins Health System began the presentation.
2. Mesrrs. Iati, Gross and Johnson re-introduced the project, noting several refinements in response to panel suggestions since the work sessions and based on feedback from the Department of Transportation and SPRC. Key modifications include:
 - a. Driveway entry throat reduced, simplified flow and circulation in the entry court
 - b. Movement of building mass results in reduction of paved area against garage and @ H-P garden, and a corresponding increase in planted area
 - c. Moved upper 7 floor mass 7.5 ' south to open up the open space between the building and Hackermann-Patz
 - d. Moved ground and second floor north lobby wall correspondingly south
 - e. Adjustments to the masonry base.
 - f. 'Bay' window mass extended northward to reduce the static symmetry of the facade.
 - g. Corner at southwest is stronger vertical expression- which still needs development
 - h. Exploring the possibility of a small outdoor viewing garden outside the food service area to create a link to the gardens below, and increase the glass area of the dining space to create a counterpoint to the tower to the south.

COMMENTS FROM THE PANEL:

1. The panel was very pleased by the willingness of the development team to respond to the comments, and noted the vast improvements improved through simplification.
2. Existing Context
 - a. The panel suggested that final elevations include context of existing and proposed development further east to show the site in context with the campus façade and massing along Broadway, noting that the Miller Research Building at the northeast corner of Broadway and Madison Street had successfully created a strong, iconic and identifiable corner for the campus.
3. Site
 - a. The panel praised the following improvements:
 - i. Entry sequence from Broadway, including reduced curb cut widths

- ii. Edging the court with trellis and low wall
 - iii. Increased landscaping
 - iv. Grade adjustments and simplification
 - v. Simplified circulation in the dropoff court
 - vi. Modifications result in a reduction of paving and increase in landscaped area
 - b. The panel suggested further refinement for the center island.
 - c. Provide further design and detail for the rain garden as the project develops. Could this become a model for Broadway?
4. Massing and Elevations
- a. The panel appreciated the development team's efforts to address building massing. The shifts toward Fayette are an improvement. However the importance of the corner of Broadway and Fayette is still not addressed effectively, and requires further study.
 - b. The adjusted two story punched windows in the base is the panel's preferred alternative.
 - c. The panel suggested that the brick base was not absolutely required to make a visual connection to adjacent buildings. Elimination of the brick base and use of the rain screen in the base may clarify the building expression, and better knit base and top. Considering the variety of color and texture options, the rain screen system from above may also be considered for the base. Bluestone, used throughout the campus and indigenous to Baltimore, may provide a base material that relates to the raised base of the adjacent campus buildings.
 - d. The panel continues to believe that the Broadway and Fayette corner needs grounding, and that the width of the corner element and distribution of solid mass and glazing needs further refinement.
 - e. Adjustments to the roof profile and further expression of dining offers an opportunity to look back toward the campus, and relate to the glass box of the lobby.

PANEL ACTION:

The panel recommended approval of the Revised Master Plan and recommended approval with comments of the Schematic building design. The panel requested the development team to consider and address the comments during final design.

Attending:

Ben Crabtree, Adam Gross, Dan McKelvey, Kevin Johnson – ASG
 Rolando Sanz – Wilmot Sanz
 Micheal Iati – Johns Hopkins
 Stanley Fine - RMG

UDARP Panel Members- Messrs. Gary Bowden, Rich Burns and David Haresign*, and Dr. Judith Meany

Planning Department- Anthony Cataldo, Christina Gaymon, Wolde Ararsa, Tamara Woods